

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/804,062	KODAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner CHAN S. PARK	Art Unit 2625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) CHAN S. PARK. (3) _____.
 (2) Obert Chu (Reg. No. 52,744). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 January 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 4.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kimura.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/CHAN S PARK/ Examiner, Art Unit 2625	
--	--

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner requested the applicant to explain whether the executed incompatibility processing incorporates any image processing. The examiner requested the applicant to explain if there are two distinct charges for the image processing and the incompatibility processing in the charging process. The examiner stated that these explanations/amendments are necessary to overcome the 112 rejection. Furthermore, the examiner suggested amending claim 4 to recite "a separate storage for storing a result of the incompatibility detection processing".